

## Remarks

Claim 1 has been amended to narrow a resource to be a document.

Claim 10 has been amended to further emphasize the “visual elements” actually display specific times of access, in “representation of the time of the most recent read access by the user to the resource” and “representation of the time of the most recent write access by the user to the resource”.

Applicant would like to point out the specification towards the end of section “GUI Comprehensive Log” teaches: “In an implementation that builds upon Apache Web server software much of the information needed for this kind of log display could be retrieved from standard Apache log files. It is possible, however, to achieve specific performance goals by implementing appropriate logging hook functions in a custom Apache module writing into a database,” thereby teaching that the user interface described throughout the section actually displays log information.

It will be appreciated by one skilled in the art that simple algorithms allow from an Apache log file to retrieve information about the most recent read (respectively write) access by a user to a resource. It will be appreciated by one skilled in the art that a logging hook function in a custom Apache module writing into a database will provide data in the database that allows better performance for retrieving information about the most recent read (respectively write) access by a user to a resource.

Applicant would further like to point out claim 10 spells out a “graphical user interface” with a “display region” with “visual elements”, whereby specifically the last verbatim mention of “visual elements” appears to define that “the time of the most recent read (respectively write) access by the user to the resource” actually is displayed. Nevertheless, Applicant in this amendment spells out more verbosely “representation of the time of the most recent read (respectively write) access by the user to the resource”.

Applicant hopes to have precluded interpretation other than that “access log information” actually is displayed.

**To comply with MPEP Section 713.04**, below is Applicant’s recollection of the substance of the interview conducted 2008-05-16.

(A) A number of user steps necessary to view and modify access control settings for a file in Windows XP has been demonstrated, as well as the lack of specific kinds of information in the displays of Windows XP.

(B) Claims 1 and 10 have been discussed.

(C) Hildebrand and Sekiguchi references have been discussed.

(D) For claim 1 it has been determined that “a resource” must further be clarified, e.g. as “a document”.

For claim 10 it has been suggested to further emphasize that “access log information” such as “most recent read access” actually is displayed.

(E) Applicant has explained that referenced prior art doesn't teach showing of information to the operator in ways that significantly increase operator productivity and significantly increase correctness of operator decisions, let alone in ways that can adapt to operator experience.

Applicant has pointed out the difference between prior art technical illustrations, which are intended to explain inner workings to software engineers involved in the design, versus the lack of substantial prior art user interface teachings.

(F) Examiner has pointed out the need to provide evidence for definitions inserted on page 3 of the application per amendment filed 2008-04-07.

Applicant has clarified that the amendment filed 2008-04-07 (NO amendment has been filed 05/01/2008) didn't introduce new statutory matter to the specification, but that some paragraphs for illustration, clarity and emphasis have been written in a format juxtaposing what the application defines, teaches or claims **in contrast** to potential or actual prior art; whereby mention of contrasting features of potential or actual prior art do **not** make such features part of the present invention.

Applicant has explained that narrowing of scope of claims, both in the amendment filed 2008-04-07 and in this amendment, is provided in order to place the application into condition for allowance.

Applicant has explained that narrowing of terms by further defining terms, both in the amendment filed 2008-04-07 and in this amendment, is provided in order to place the application into condition for allowance or as correction of informalities.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leo Baschy/

Leo Baschy

Applicant Pro Se

Date 2008-06-11